

Commissioner for Patents United States Patent and Trademark Office P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

BAKER & BOTTS 30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA NEW YORK NY 10112

## COPY MAILED

JUN 2 4 2005

## OFFICE OF PETITIONS

In re Application of

Mruz et al.

Application No. 09/896,171 ON PETITION

Filed: 29 June, 2002

Atty Docket No. A34634-

070378.0108

This is a decision on the petition filed on 25 March, 2005, under 37 CFR 1.137(b), to revive the above-identified application.

The petition is GRANTED.

The application became abandoned on 31 March, 2004, for failure to timely reply to the Office action in accordance with Ex parte

 $<sup>^{1}</sup>$  Effective December 1, 1997, the provisions of 37 CFR 1.137(b) now provide that where the delay in reply was unintentional, a petition may be filed to revive an abandoned application or a lapsed patent pursuant to 37 CFR 1.137(b). A grantable petition filed under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.137(b) must be accompanied by:

<sup>(1)</sup> the required reply, unless previously filed. In a nonprovisional application abandoned for failure to prosecute, the required reply may be met by the filing of a continuing application. In a nonprovisional utility or plant application filed on or after June 8, 1995, and abandoned for failure to prosecute, the required reply may also be met by the filing of a request for continuing examination in compliance with § 1.114. In an application or patent, abandoned or lapsed for failure to pay the issue fee or any portion thereof, the required reply must be the payment of the issue fee or any outstanding balance thereof.

<sup>(2)</sup> the petition fee as set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(m);

<sup>(3)</sup> a statement that the entire delay in filing the required reply from the due date for the reply until the filing of a grantable petition pursuant to 37 CFR 1.137(b) was unintentional. The Commissioner may required additional information where there is a question whether the delay was unintentional; and

<sup>(4)</sup> any terminal disclaimer (and fee as set forth in 37 CFR 1.20(d)) required pursuant to 37 CFR 1.137(c)).

Quayle<sup>2</sup> mailed on 30 January, 2004, which set a two (2) month shortened statutory period for reply. No extensions of the time for reply in accordance with 37 CFR 1.136(a) were obtained. Notice of Abandonment was mailed on 24 August, 2004. The petition filed on 25 October, 2004, was dismissed on 24 January, 2005.

Petitioners' reply filed on 25 March, 2005, has been deemed to place this case in condition for allowance.

The application file is being referred to Technology Center 2817 for further processing.

Telephone inquiries concerning this matter may be directed to the undersigned at (571)272-3231.

Douglas I. Wood

Senior Petitions Attorney

Office of Petitions

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213